

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending herein.

By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended to more fully distinguish the invention of the claims over the teachings of Japanese Patent No. 06-289415, Japanese Patent Publication No. 2000-194013, U.S. Patent No. 5,636,329 and U.S. Patent No. 5,608,559 cited against this claim. Claims 10-14 have been added.

No new matter is added by this amendment. Support for the amendments to claim 1 is found in the original specification and Figures. In particular, support for the language added to claim 1 is found at, for example, Figs. 5a and 5b. Support for new claim 10 is found at, for example, Figs. 5a and 6a. Support for new claim 11 is found at, for example, Figs. 5b and 6b. Support for new claim 12 is found at, for example, paragraph [0027] of the specification. Support for new claims 13 and 14 is found at, for example, paragraph [0040] of the specification.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies shown to Applicant's representative by Examiner Parker in the December 30, 2003 interview. Applicant's separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

I. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant notes with appreciation that claims 3, 5 and 6 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

A. Kitawada

Claims 1, 2, 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Japanese Patent No. 06-289415 (hereinafter "Kitawada"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites an electro-optical device comprising an electro-optical material, a substrate that supports the electro-optical material, a first wiring formed on a surface of the substrate, an insulating layer that covers the first wiring, the insulating layer being formed on the surface of the substrate, and a second wiring formed over a first region of the insulating layer that includes a region overlapping a region in which the electro-optical material is formed, and a second region which corresponds to a remaining region other than the first region of the insulating layer, the second wiring being connected to the first wiring via a plurality of contact holes formed within the first region of the insulating layer.

The Patent Office alleged that Kitawada teaches a second wiring 305 being connected to the first wiring via a contact hole formed within the first region of the insulating layer.

However, Kitawada fails to teach or suggest the second wiring being connected to the first wiring via a plurality of contact holes formed within the first region of the insulating layer, as recited in claim 1.

Instead, Kitawada discloses a second wiring 305 connected to a first wiring 318 via a single contact hole. See Figure (c).

Thus, Kitawada fails to at least disclose the second wiring being connected to the first wiring via a plurality of contact holes, as recited in claim 1.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Kitawada fails to anticipate the subject matter of claim 1 and claims 2, 8 and 9 depending therefrom.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

B. Hoshino

Claims 1, 2, 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Japanese Patent Publication No. 2000-194013 to Komeno et al. (hereinafter "Hoshino"). In a telephone conversation with the Examiner on November 6, 2003, the Examiner stated that the rejection should be in view of Japanese Patent Publication No. 2000-

194013 to "Hoshino" and not to "Komeno". The Examiner indicated that any reference to Komeno et al. in the Office Action should actually be to Hoshino. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Patent Office alleged that Hoshino discloses the ITO layer crossing into the liquid crystal region and connecting a lower electrode through a hole, through insulator 48. Therefore, the Patent Office alleged, the claims are anticipated.

However, nowhere does Hoshino teach or suggest at least a second wiring being connected to the first wiring via a plurality of contact holes formed within the first region of the insulating layer, as recited in claim 1.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Hoshino fails to anticipate the subject matter of claim 1 and claims 2, 8 and 9 depending therefrom. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

A. Sukegawa in view of Inada

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,636,329 (hereinafter "Sukegawa") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,608,559 (hereinafter "Inada"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites, in part, an electro-optical device comprising a second wiring, the second wiring being connected to the first wiring via a plurality of contact holes formed within the first region of the insulating layer.

Claim 4 recites, in part, an electro-optical device, comprising a second wiring connected to the electronic component, the second wiring being formed over the surface of the insulating layer, and connected to the first wiring via a contact hole formed within the mounting region.

The Patent Office acknowledged that Sukegawa fails to disclose the use of chip on glass devices, flexible circuits, or the opposite substrate with the electro-optical material in the middle. However, the Patent Office alleged that an opposite substrate and electro-optic material is inherent to any liquid crystal device, that chip on glass with the integrated circuit is well known, and thus it would have been obvious to employ an electronic component as claimed.

The Patent Office has failed to indicate how Inada could be combined with Sukegawa to teach the claimed invention.

Nonetheless, the presently claimed invention can not be achieved by Sukegawa and Inada, alone or in combination. Specifically, nowhere do Sukegawa or Inada teach or suggest a second wiring being connected to the first wiring via a plurality of contact holes formed within the first region of the insulating layer, as recited in claim 1. Further, nowhere do Sukegawa or Inada teach or suggest a second wiring connected to the electronic component, the second wiring being formed over the surface of the insulating layer, and connected to the first wiring via a contact hole formed within the mounting region, as recited in claim 4.

Instead, the transparent conductive film layer (ITO) of Inada is formed under the insulating layer. Because the ITO layer of Inada is farther from the terminal of the IC than in the present invention, it is more difficult to bring the ITO layer into contact with the terminal. Sukegawa fails to remedy this deficiency.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Sukegawa or Inada, whether taken singularly or in combination, would not have led one of ordinary skill in the art to the invention of claims 1 and 4, or any of depending claims 2 and 7-9. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are thus respectfully requested.

B. Hoshino in view of Inada

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hoshino in view of Inada. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant submits that nothing in Inada remedies the deficiencies with Hoshino discussed above. That is, nothing in the combined teachings of Hoshino and Inada would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to a second wiring being connected to the first wiring via a plurality of contact holes formed within the first region of the insulating layer, as recited in claim 1; or to a second wiring connected to the electronic component, the second wiring being formed over the surface of the insulating layer, and connected to the first wiring via a contact hole formed within the mounting region, as recited in claim 4.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Hoshino and Inada, whether taken singularly or in combination, would not have led one of ordinary skill in the art to the invention of claims 1 and 4, or any of depending claims 2 and 7-9. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are thus respectfully requested.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-14 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Linda M. Saltiel
Registration No. 51,122

JAO:LMS/hs

Date: January 2, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--